DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 687 SP 033 584

AUTHOR Ochoa, Alberto M.
TITLE New Teacher Retention Project: Final Performance Report FY 1989-91. Series on Equity Issues in Education.
INSTITUTION San Diego State Univ., Calif. Social Equity Technical Assistance Center.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jan 92
CONTRACT 84.003R; T003R80101-90
NOTE 76p.
AVAILABLE FROM Social Equity Technical Assistance Center, 6363 Alvarado Court, Suite 226, San Diego, CA 92120.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education Programs; *Bilingual Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Limited English Speaking; *Program Evaluation; *Student Needs; *Teacher Persistence; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *New Teacher Retention Project (San Diego)

ABSTRACT

This publication evaluates the New Teacher Retention Title VII Project conducted at San Diego State University. The Project addressed the following national problems: (1) the need to upgrade the skills of bilingual and other teachers working with children who have limited English proficiency; (2) provision of training in order to increase teacher retention; and (3) development of inservice training to enhance the professional development of bilingual teachers. The document, organized into five sections, opens with the executive summary. Section 2 describes the background of the project, including goals, social context, California and San Diego County bilingual teacher needs, personnel training, and the training approach. Section 3 discusses the project methodology. Section 4, divided into five parts, examines training evaluation results, increasing teachers' bilingual skills, support systems for new bilingual teachers, new teacher retention program, and future new teacher retention program suggestions. The final section summarizes findings. Four appendices include: (1) Title VII Bilingual Teacher Program Survey; (2) Evaluation of New Bilingual Teacher Program; (3) Sample Case Study and Critical Incident Guidelines; and (4) Participant Responses to Program Suggestions. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED341687

THE SOCIAL EQUITY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER

FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT
FY 1989-91

United States Office of Education
Contract No. 84.003 R
T003R80101-90

SERIES ON EQUITY ISSUES IN EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A.M. Ochoa

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FOR ADDITIONAL COPIES—CONTACT THE SOCIAL EQUITY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER—6363 ALVARADO COURT, SUITE 226
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92120
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
TELEPHONE: (714) 265-6403 or 6692

SP033584

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NEW TEACHER RETENTION PROJECT
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY

FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT
FY 1989-91

United States Office of Education
Contract No. 84.003 R
T003R80101-90

Submitted

by

Alberto M. Ochoa
Evaluator

January 1992

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3

SECTION II - BACKGROUND OF NEW TEACHER RETENTION PROJECT 8

Goals 8
Social Context 9
California and San Diego County Bilingual Teacher Needs 10
Training Personnel 11
Training Approach 12

SECTION III - METHODOLOGY 14

SECTION IV - FINDINGS

Part 1: Training Presentations Evaluation Results 18

Part 2: Increase Teacher Bilingual Skills 19

Ten Selected Areas of Training
Case Studies
Critical Incidents

Part 3: Support System For New Bilingual Teacher 23

Transfer of Bilingual Inservice 25
Program Opportunities 26
Teaching Methodologies 27
Cluster Leader Support 28
Participation in Training Perceived Results 28
Correlation of Selected Variables 30

Part 4: New Teacher Retention Program 34

Strengths
Weaknesses
Derived Benefits

Part 5: Future New Teacher Retention Program Suggestions 37

SECTION V -Summary of Findings 41

APPENDICES 47

Appendix A Title VII Bilingual Teacher Program Survey 48
Appendix B Evaluation of New Bilingual Teacher Program 52
Appendix C Sample Case Study and Critical Incident Guidelines 54
Appendix D Participant Responses to Program Suggestions 62

SECTION I

Final Performance Report
Evaluation Report
FY 1989-91

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The New Bilingual Teacher Retention Program, housed at the San Diego State University Policy Studies Department completed the third year of rendering training and support services under Contract No.T003R80101-90. This executive summary provides the reader with a synopsis of the program evaluation for the period of 1989 to September 30, 1991.

The **New Teacher Retention Title VII Project** was designed to addressed three growing national problems in education:

- the need to upgrade the skills of bilingual and other teachers working with LEP children;

- providing training that will increase retention and enhance the possibilities for additional career opportunities for those teachers to stay in the field of education, and

- developing training beyond the initial teacher training experience to prepare bilingual teachers to enhance their professional development.

In the three-year period **(1989 to 1991) the New Teacher Retention Project**, involved and trained 181 teachers. These teachers had a background in the liberal arts and sciences; thus possessing an academic foundation for teaching. In their fifth year, in the teacher education elementary bilingual program, the teachers were introduced to teaching through field experiences in local classrooms, through course work in English and Spanish, and through special seminars designed to enhance their professional skills for teaching.

through special seminars designed to enhance their professional skills for teaching.

Three goals were the focused of the New Teacher Retention Program:

1. To develop a support system for new bilingual teachers;
2. To facilitate the development of a three year professional development plan for each teacher; and
3. To increase the retention of teachers in the field by upgrading their skills in selected areas agreed by the teachers.

The professional training was provided through a program collaboratively designed and delivered by the College of Education and six participating public school districts (Valley Center Elementary; Vista Unified ; San Diego City Schools; National schools Elementary; South bay Union Elementary; and San Ysidro Elementary).

The anticipated outcomes were:

1. At the end of the project a support system for new credentialed bilingual teachers, to enhance their teaching skills, will be used by participating school districts.

2. At the end of the project participating teachers will indicate growth, in their professional development through training received, in selected areas of professional growth.

(3) At the end of the project teachers will have upgraded their bilingual skills.

The **methodology used in the evaluation** of the New Teacher Retention Project for the three year period of 1989 to 1991 included the following approaches:

1. Examination of training session evaluations, surveys, records of attendance, written documentation of critical incidents written by participants, case studies used and written by participants on their classroom professional growth activities..

2. Project inservice documents during the 1989-1991 period.

3. A questionnaire was developed to obtain participant opinions on five training components of the program. Questions asked dealt with:

- the transfer of bilingual inservice skills;
- specific opportunities provided through the program;
- skills derived from inservice on teaching methodologies;
- support provided to participants by cluster leaders, and
- participation in program training resulted in what skill development.

A questionnaire for the three year period was sent to all of the participants that had participated in the training (n=71). An SPPSx statistical program was used to analyze the data.

The **findings of the evaluation** indicate that the New Teacher Retention Project was able to accomplished its objectives:

1. The project at the end of its three year period conceptualized, implemented and infused its training design into the Multiple Subjects Bilingual Emphasis Credential Program at SDSU/College of Education;

2. The project influenced the training coordinators of the six cooperating school districts to provide support training to newly hired credentialed teachers.

3. The cluster leader was found to have played a significant role in nurturing teacher participation; implementing trainings; supportive in peer coaching; modeling effective teaching strategies; being motivational in holding high standards for students, and effective in matching student needs with teaching strategies.

4. The project initiated an ongoing dialogue with the bilingual teacher education programs about the mutual cooperation and support to newly credentialed bilingual teachers.

5. The participating teachers in the NTRP indicated growth in their professional development through the training received in selected areas of professional growth. **Specifically, areas of highest growth were:**

- Transfer of bilingual new teching methods.
- Transfer of bilingual teaching skills.
- Transfer of innovative teaching strategies in the classroom.
- Transfer in using new teaching strategies and methodologies.
- Interest in new teaching techniques.
- Meeting and networking with peers.
- Opportunities to share and practice lessons with peers.
- Enhancing skills as a bilingual teacher.

The areas of least perceived growth were:

- Written assignments related to case studies and critical incidents.
- Acquiring new computer skills for classroom use.
- Using research to show the effectiveness of teaching methodologies.
- Approaches for teaching English as a Second language.

6. Analysis of the data using correlation coefficients suggests that the variables that are associated with **participation in the program** had the strongest correlations, at the moderate(lowest being .6063) to the high dependable levels (highest being .9292). Specifically, these variables are "developing your use of various teaching methodologies," "enhancing your classroom management skills," "enhancing your skills to motivate diverse learners," "integrating the social context of your students to your lessons," "improvements in your teaching skills," "enhancing your skills to work with parents," and "enhancing your skills as a bilingual teacher."

The variable "**developing your use of various teaching methodologies**," was correlated with varaibles associated with activities modeling methodology and with the cluster leader modeling effective teaching strategies, being motivational in holding high standards for lingustically diverse students, and in providing skills to improve Spanish teaching proficiency.

The variable "**enhancing your classroom management skills**," was correlated with variables that provided opportunity to participate in teaching

demonstrations, cluster leader modeling effective teaching strategies, and developing use of various teaching methodologies.

The variable "**enhancing your skills to motivate diverse learners,**" was correlated with variables related to developing use of various teaching strategies and enhancing classroom management skills.

The variable "**integrating the social context of your students to your lessons,**" was correlated with variables associated with implementing innovative teaching strategies in the classroom; opportunity to use new teaching approaches; cluster leader involvement in training, as well as modeling effective teaching strategies; holding high standards for diverse learners; and effective in matching student needs with teaching strategy. As well as with the variables related to developing use of various teaching strategies, classroom management, and skills to motivate diverse learners.

The variable "**improvements in your teaching skills,**" was correlated with variables related to opportunity to participate in teaching demonstrations, research showing the effectiveness of the methodology, modeling, and cluster leader presence in the inservice, as well as modeling, holding high standards for diverse learners and matching student needs with teaching strategy.

The variable "**enhancing your skills to work with parents**" was correlated with two variables associated with "improvements in your teaching skills" plus "opportunity to develop bilingual teaching materials."

The variable "**enhancing your skills as a bilingual teacher**" was correlated with variables addressing the transfer of bilingual inservice, opportunity to participate in teaching demonstrations and developing bilingual materials, and cluster leader support as a model of effective teaching strategies, holding high standards, and matching students needs with teaching strategy.

7. Lastly, due to the training received in the NTRP, the participating teachers agreed that their skills were upgraded and that their projected career plans were fostered and enhanced as bilingual teachers.

Section II

NEW TEACHER RETENTION PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT

The evaluation report is divided into five sections. Namely, the executive summary, background of the project, methodology, findings, and summary of the findings.

Background of the Project

In the **three-year period (1989 to 1991) of the New Teacher Retention Project**, the project involved and trained 181 teachers. These teachers have a background in the liberal arts and social sciences; and possessed a strong knowledge base for teaching. In the fifth year of college, they participated in a teacher education elementary bilingual program. The teachers were introduced to teaching through field experiences in local classrooms, through coursework in English and Spanish, and through special seminars designed to enhance their professional skills for teaching.

Three goals were the focused of the New Teacher Retention Program (NTRP):

1. To develop a support system for new bilingual teachers;
2. To facilitate the development of a three year professional development plan for each teacher; and
3. To increase the retention of teachers in the field by upgrading their skills in selected areas agreed by the teachers.

The professional training provided by the NTRP was provided through a program collaboratively designed and delivered by the College of Education and six participating public school districts, These school districts were:

- Valley Center Elementary School District
- Vista Unified School District
- San Diego City Schools District
- National Schools Elementary School District
- South Bay Union Elementary School District, and
- San Ysidro Elementary School District

The characteristics of these school districts include a student population that is predominantly ethnically diverse, and have significantly large numbers of limited English proficient (LEP) student population. These districts are also experiencing one of greatest demographic changes in recent history, which is the unprecedented LEP student growth during the last three years.

Social Context

The social context of the six public school systems within the state of California presents two related problems. First, the number of minority students is increasing, but simultaneously the number of teachers from minority groups is declining. Secondly, thirty-three percent of California's 4,770,000 public school students are Latino/Hispanic (California State Dept. of Education Data BICAL, 1989), and their numbers are rising faster than those of any other group. Even conservative predictions show the number of Latino/Hispanics in California doubling in the next 30 years. In 1989, Caucasian students were a minority in the State (California State Dept. of Education Data BICAL, 1989).

However, Latino/Hispanic students are dropping-out of school at a rate near or greater than 50%, according to a recent study by the State Department of Education (1988). Approximately 80% of Hispanic students who are fluent in English are performing below grade level by the third grade, and half of the State's Hispanic students perform in the bottom quarter on basic proficiency tests and attend schools that are rated in the lowest quarter in terms of test scores (Espinosa, 1985). One-fifth of Hispanic students classified as gifted dropout of school.

Fewer talented minority students are completing their education, and very few are entering the teaching profession. Latino/Hispanic teachers comprise less than 6% of California's 170,000 teachers, the most underrepresented group in the State (Commission for Teacher Credentialing, 1988). This means that just as the number of ethnically diverse children in the population is rapidly increasing, ethnically diverse teachers are disappearing from the classroom. Thus, the possibility that minority students will ever have teachers from their own ethnic background is slim, and minority students are being deprived of important role models in the critical years when they are forming their own identities, ambitions, and images as students.

"By the year 2000, the percentage of ethnically diverse persons in the teaching force of the United States could be cut almost in half," predicted Gregory R. Anrig, president of the Educational Testing Service, the major producer of tests used in screening prospective teachers. This long-term erosion of the ethnically diverse teaching force will exacerbate the general teacher shortage that will continue to develop as the children of baby boomers reach school age. According to the National Education Association (1989), "by 1995, only 5 percent of the nations teachers will be minority."

One reason for this decline in ethnically diverse teachers is the competency test failure rate of ethnically diverse who express an interest in teaching. California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) results consistently show Hispanics and Blacks having the greatest proportion of nonpassing scores. As the Carnegie Task Force report (1988) states, "Many prospective teachers from minority groups fail to meet high standards for teaching, not for lack of ability, but because the schools have failed to provide and demand what was needed for success." The educational system, from kindergarten through college, must bear responsibility for addressing this problem and for finding suitable solutions.

California's Bilingual Needs

The state of California is woefully short of qualified bilingual teachers and is rapidly falling behind in meeting the demand for these teachers (Sec. 702). According to the Bilingual Teacher Supply and Demand Study and the Status Report on Bilingual Teacher Preparation presented by the Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing to the California State Legislature in April, 1981, there was a demand for 11,151 additional bilingual teachers in 1981-82, for 12,667 in 1982-83 and over 13,500 in 1983-84. The projections for the rest

of the decade was even more awesome. The greatest supply of bilingual teachers comes from the California State University System. During each academic year, it is projected that the total system will only supply between 430-470 bilingual teachers in both Emphasis and Specialist credentialing programs. There are currently only 7000 bilingual teachers for 770,000 LEP students in California (California State Dept. of Education Data BiCal, 1989).

The predictions of the California State Department of Education (1988) are that the total graduating high school enrollment will decline almost 22% over the next five years. The decline in student enrollment will be even more significant, and hence, will lessen the population of potential teachers. In contrast, the elementary age population will increase 25%, with minority students increasing at a higher rate.

San Diego County Needs

The **local needs** of San Diego and Imperial counties bear the full brunt of California's immigration of Spanish speaking students. The counties have a combined Hispanic school-age population of 68,105, of whom 54% are LEP (California State Dept. of Education Data BiCal, 1989). The districts served by the NTRP had the following populations:

	LEP Students	Teachers	Current Teacher/Student Ratio
San Diego City	19,402	185	1:104
National	2,505	74	1:33
San Ysidro	3,065	65	1:47
South Bay	1,998	66	1:30
Vista Unified			
Valley Center	408	14	1:29

These districts range from the sixth largest city in the U.S. to a rural community. These districts are in need of teachers who are able to provide bilingual instruction. Because there are not sufficient numbers of bilingual teachers, the children are provided mostly instruction in English. The majority of these students are underachieving.

Training Personnel

The New Teacher Retention program during the three year period employed bilingual personnel that are recognized for being knowledgeable and conversant in the areas of (1) First and Second Language Theory, (2) Effective Schools Theory, (3) language arts methodology,including the Natural Language Approach, Total Physical Response Sheltered English, and the Whole Language Approach, (4) and Staff Coaching. The trainers and project cluster leaders were also selected for an in-depth knowledge in applying theory to practice as it refers to effective staff development. The support staff collectively and individually reflected knowledge, experience, and expertise as it refers to assisting school districts in building their capacity for improving instruction to LEP students. School districts through the NTRP provided release time for teachers, facilities for conducting meetings and training sessions, and dissemination of information.

Training Approach

The approach for carrying out the training and support services was both process and model oriented. The initial identification of training begun with a needs assessment that focuses on staff development needs, prioritizing of training areas, the identification of the type of approach of workshops, the identification of consultants expertise, and the determination of training location and days preferred. The following outlines the NTRP process in conjunction with the school districts, in planning and implementing supplementary training activities:

- Meet with NTRP Advisory Panel to carry out project requirements.
- Determine the recipients of training
- Assess the Title VII training needs of participants.
- Determine which priority training areas were to be addressed during each of the three years.
- Determine the core content areas of training.
- Determine the mode/format through which training was be delivered.
- Determine the professional staff, including external consultants, that was responsible for carrying out the training activities.
- Determine the schedule and sites of training.
- Implement training activities.
- Monitor and evaluate training activities.

In addition, the following interactive approach was used in the planning and delivery of training:

- Collaborative planning and decision making involving multiple school districts and support service agencies.
- Use of training teams made up of project personnel and external consultants that included both theoreticians and practitioners.
- Use of trainee teams comprised of a cluster leader and between four to five members from the same school district/site.
- Use of trainer of trainer and transfer of training strategies.
- Use of Cooperative Learning training strategies.

As is evident from the above, the procedure for planning and carrying out the training activities was collaborative. Engaging at every step, school district personnel and project personnel in important decisions regarding the nature and scope of training. The involvement of school personnel ensured that the training results in the improvement of skills of bilingual teachers ultimately led to program improvement and capacity building.

The following **training modes and formats** were used to implement the training activities.

Traditional Conference Mode: Typically, this mode of training involved a plenary session for all participating trainees followed by smaller informational and/or practical level presentations on a wider variety of training topics and strands.

Workshop Mode: Generally, this training mode involved a formal meeting at which specialists within a particular area make presentations on current topics of concern or importance relevant to the schooling of language minority LEP students.

Individual Professional Growth Plan Individualized training format planned focusing on a series of inservice sessions or training session over a period of time to develop and enhance specific teaching skills.

Section III

METHODOLOGY

The number of participants who received training in the three year period totaled 181. Six school districts participated in the three year period of the NTRP The participants by year are presented in Table 1. A total of 42 formal training activities were provided to the participants.

Table I
Participants Trained 1989-1991

Year	1st 1988-89	2nd 1989-90	3rd 1990-91	Total
Number of Participants New Teachers	20	20	20	60
Prospective Teachers	30	38	42	110
Cluster Teachers/leaders	4	4	3	11
Subtotal	54	72	65	181
Training Sessions	18	12	12	42

In the 1989-90 year, 54 participants received training, of which 20 received full project support with respect to training, tuition, substitute release time, book, and conference registration support to specialized bilingual programs. Thirty (30) candidates received tuition, training, access to the project specialized K-6 bilingual library, and support to attend specialized bilingual

conferences. The last four participants were the cluster leaders who served as teacher mentors.

In the second year, the NTRP provided training to 62 participants. twenty (20) received full support, 38 partial support, and 4 were cluster leaders who served as mentors to the teachers.

In the third year, the NTRP provided training to 65 participants. Once again, 20 received full support, 42 partial support, and 3 were cluster leaders who served as mentors to the teachers.

The general characteristics of the sample are outlined as follows:

Characteristics of Sample

Sex:	**24% male**	**76% Female**		
Age:	**20%**	**18 to 24;**	**46%**	**24 to 30**
	24%	**31 to 40;**	**10%**	**are over 40**
Years of Teaching:	**66%**	**1-3;**	**28%**	**4-7**
	2%	**8-12;**	**4%**	**over 13**
Grade level teaching:	**45%**	**K-2;**	**54%**	**3-5**

Institution of teacher training: **88% CSU Ssytem**
2% UC System
10% Private Colleges

The characteristics of the participants of the NTRP indicate that they were predominantly recently credentialed teachers (66%); reported to have 1 to no more than 3 years of teaching experience; 76% were female; over 66% have less than 30 years of age, while 90% are less than 40 years. Furthermore, 100% reported to teach at the Kinder to 5th grade, with some teachers reporting having taught in more than three grade levels; lastly, 88% were graduates of the California State University System.

Data Analysis

The data used to evaluate the New Teacher Retention Project for the three year period of 1989 to 1991 included the following approaches:

1. Project inservice documents during the 1989-1991 period.

2. Examination of training session evaluations, records of attendance, written documentation of critical incidents written by participants, case studies used and written by participants on their professional growth.

3. Analysis of a survey completed by the participants at the end of the training program.

4. A questionnaire was developed to elicit participant opinions on six training components of the program. The questionnaire asked for participant response to:

- the transfer of bilingual inservice skills;
- specific opportunities provided through the program;
- skills derived from inservice on teaching methodologies;
- support provided to participants by cluster leaders, and
- participation in program training resulted in what skill development.

The above stated questionnaire was sent to all of the 71 participants (n=71) that had participated and received full support from the NTRP for the three year period. The SPPSx statistical program was used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics and correlations were analyzed to determine patterns of responses and the salient variables that proved to have the highest strength.

Instruments

The following instruments and/or data were used to report on the various components of the evaluation:

1. An evaluation survey was given to the participants after each training activity. These surveys were tabulated to yield a general pattern of participant satisfaction.

2. To determine the perceptions of participants with regards to the Increase of Teacher Bilingual Skills acquired through the NTRP a survey developed by the program staff entitled **"Evaluation of New Bilingual Teacher Program Survey"** (see Appendix B) was completed by participants.

In addition, the documentation developed by participants in the form of **Case Studies and Critical Incidents** (see Appendix C) were reviewed. These reviews of the case studies and critical incidents yielded general themes to indicate what areas of educational reflection and practice the participants became involved.

3. To obtain opinions on the Support System For New Bilingual Teacher an instrument entitled **"Title VII Bilingual Survey"** (see Appendix A) was used. This instrument was designed to obtain the opinions of participants related to: Characteristics of Participant Classroom and District, Transfer of Bilingual Inservice, Program Opportunities, Teaching Methodologies, Cluster Leader Support, Participation in Training Perceived Results.

4. To determine what suggestions and/or impressions the participants had with respect to the **strengths and weaknesses of the NTRP** specific open ended questions were asked and analyzed (see Appendix A "Title VII Bilingual Teacher Program Survey" and Appendix B "Evaluation of New Bilingual Teacher Program." These sections directly addressed the strengths weaknesses and derived benefits of the NTRP.

Section IV

FINDINGS

The findings of the New Teacher Retention Program are discussed in five parts. Part 1 presents the participants evaluations of the training presentations. Part 2 presents the perceptions of participants' with respect to the increase of teacher bilingual skills in ten selected areas of training and examines case studies and critical incidents. Part 3 presents the perceptions of the participants with respect to support systems for new bilingual teachers in six training categories. Part 4 presents the strengths and weaknesses of the NTRP. Part 5 doccuments suggestions for improving future NTRP activities.

Part 1: Training Presentations Evaluation Results

Approximately 21 to 50 percent of the training sessions were tabulated to estimate the impact of training. What follows is a summary of participant evaluation responses reflected in average percentages, using an item instrument.

Item 1: How Adequately Did The Presentation Meet Your Needs?

Based on the responses to this item, 95% of the clients sampled strongly agreed or agreed that the presenter was organized.

Item 2: Will You Be Able To Use What Was Presented In Your Classroom?

With reference to this item, 94.9% of the recipients of training responded, strongly agreed, or agreed that the presentation were well delivered.

Item 3: Overall Evaluation Of The Presentation

A total of 93.5% of those responding to this item, strongly agreed, or agreed that the presentation expanded knowledge/skills.

In all of the above three items, less than 7% disagreed on the quality of training rendered by the NTRP consultants. One major factor for achieving such high positive feedback appears to be due to a staff that has many years of work experience in the planning, developing, and implementing staff development training

Part 2: INCREASE TEACHER BILINGUAL SKILLS

Participants' rating of ten selected areas of training were derived using a Likert Scale instrument (see Appendix B). The perceptions of the participants were also ranked with respect to the ten selected areas of training. The findings in Table I indicate that the quality of services provided by the trainers during the three year program rated as low as 3.11 to as high as 4.42, with 3 being of moderate value to 4 equating with useful value. None of the ten selected ten areas are rated below 3.11.

In the overall analysis of the above ten questions, the participants assessed **six of the ten areas of the program above 4.0 or "of value."** Relevance of the program was rated the highest with a mean of 4.42, followed closely by receiving course credit for training with a mean of 4.37. The third highest rated area was developing a network with other teachers. Professional inservice presentations by speakers was rated 4.11; meeting with peers was ranked fifth with a mean of 4.08, and utility of program for the classroom was rated 4.00. The least rated areas of the program were the preparation of case studies and discussion of critical incidents, two types of inservice activities with mean scores of of 3.11 and 3.32 respectively. These two last ratings suggest that the two type of activities had a moderate value to participants. The classrooms visits were rated as 3.57 and the meetings with cluster leaders as 3.84, suggesting a moderate to useful value to participants.

Overall, the assessment of the program by participants suggests that the Program was successful in facilitating the professional growth of bilingual teachers, providing an avenue for networking and in interacting with professional that shared specific expertise in bilingual methodologies and teaching strategies.

Table I

Evaluation Averages of New Bilingual Teacher Program

Scale: (1) Little Value (2) Somewhat of value (3) Moderate Value
(4) Useful (5) Very Useful

		N	Standard Deviation	Mean	Rank
1.	Presentation by Speakers	37	3.0	4.11	4
2.	Discussions on Critical Incidents	37	4.0	3.32	9
3.	Preparation of Case Studies	37	4.0	3.11	10
4.	Meetings With Cluster Leaders	37	3.0	3.84	7
5.	Classroom Visits	37	4.0	3.57	8
6.	Meetings With Peers	37	3.0	4.08	5
7.	Course Credit	37	3.0	4.37	2
8.	Relevance of Program to My Professional Growth	37	3.0	4.42	1
9.	Utility of Program to My Classroom	37	3.0	4.00	6
10.	Developing a Network With Others	37	4.0	4.19	3

Case Studies and Critical Incidents. To examine the reflection undertaken by participants with respect to their classroom experiences and concerns in responding to limited English proficient students Case Studies and

Critical Incidents (see Appendix C) were reviewed. Correlational analysis and content analysis were the two approaches used.

Using the Title VII Bilingual Survey (see Appendix A and Table VII) the relationship between four variables related to the training opportunities provided by the NTRP and seven variables related to program participation were analyzed using Pearson product-movement correlation coefficient calculations. The four opportunity variables were: to analyze classroom critical incidents (OPPD), opportunity to study and examine case studies of lessons ((OPPK), classroom management (OPPL), and discipline (OPPM). The seven variables related to program participation were: *developing use of various teaching methodologies (PRA); enhancing classroom management skills (PRB); enhancing skills to motivate diverse learners (PRC); integrating the social context of students to your lessons (PRD); improvements in teaching skills (PRE); enhancing skills to work with parents (PRF), and enhancing skills as a bilingual teacher (PRG).* The correlation coefficients of these variables indicate a low (.20) to moderate (.60) correlation levels, while many being significant at the .05 (*) and .01 (**) level.

Correlational Coefficient Matrix of Selected Variables With Critical Incidents and Case Studies

	OPPD (C Incidents)	OPPK (Lessons)	OPPL (Mgmt)	OPP (Discipline)
PRA	-.0594	.3386*	.2723	.3088*
PRB	.3133*	.22013	.1772	.4727**
PRC	.0028	.4062**	.1304	.3331*
PRD	.2357	.5766**	.4250**	.4935**
PRE	.2642	.4029**.	.4551**	.5803**
PRF	.3796**	.1668	.4220**	.5292**
PRG	.2131	.2156	.1526	.2993*

Specifically, analysis of **classroom critical incident** is significant with enhancing classroom management skills and skills to work with parents. **Case studies of lessons** are significant with use of various teaching methodologies, skills to motivate diverse learners, integrating the social context of students to

lessons, and improvement in teaching skills. **Case studies of classroom management** are significant with integrating the social context of the students to lessons, improvement of teaching skills, and skills to work with parents. Lastly, **case studies on discipline** are significant with all of the seven variables.

A **content analysis of the critical incidents** indicated that the themes most frequently examined by the participants were:

- issues dealing with classroom discipline and communication
- issues addressing administrators perceptions of the teachers
- curriculum planning and bilingual resources
- aggressive and rude student to student interactions and use of language
- students working cooperatively and independently
- parent-teacher communication focusing on behavior of student
- availability of bilingual materials
- student ability levels and motivation
- student language proficiency in the L1 and L2
- student literacy in L1 and L2
- feeling guilty in not being able to enhance the learning of students
- keeping-up with school programmed curriculum
- physical structure of classroom
- increasing the self esteem of students
- institutional labels and expectations ascribed to students

The records of the training sessions speak of "each teacher sharing his/her critical incident with the group and together brainstorming possible solutions. In these discussion, according to a cluster leaders, "each teacher came to recognize that he/she was not alone and that every one was experiencing some kind of frustration, anxiety or need to problem solve a concern."

A **content analysis of the case studies** indicated that the areas most frequently examined by the participants were classroom discipline and management.

Under **classroom discipline** the issues embedded in the reports of the participants included approaches and styles of discipline; parent-teacher communication; parent expectations; rewards and sanction; and addressing specific behavior problems.

In the area of **classroom management** the concerns expressed dealt with how to implement specialized teaching strategies such as whole language, experienced based approach, sheltered English, cooperative learning, and keeping-up with the principals expectations of what teachers needed to cover by a certain time.

In the area of curriculum planning, **preparing effective lessons,** the participants opinions pointed to the need to develop, create or modify bilingual resources to support and deliver a lesson; the need for skills to effectively create units based on curriculum themes; the need to integrate science, literature, social studies, and math to the study of selected themes; and lastly to the importance of pacing a lesson.

Part 3: Support System for New Bilingual Teacher

To obtain opinions on the Support System For New Bilingual Teacher an instrument entitled **"Title VII Bilingual Survey"** (see Appendix A) was used. This instrument was designed to obtain the opinions of participants related to: Characteristics of Participant Classroom and District, Transfer of Bilingual Inservice, Program Opportunities, Teaching Methodologies, Cluster Leader Support, and Participation in Training Perceived Results.

Characteristics of Participants

The participants in the New Teacher Retention Program work under common and diverse classroom and school district conditions. In their classrooms, over 90% indicated that they teach average to low ability students. With respect to the number of students for which English is a second language, teachers reported that they have about 72% in their classrooms, and that over 40% are classified LEP students. With regards to what percentage of Spanish is used by teachers in their classroom, teachers reported 38% use Spanish between 41% to 60% of the time,

while 28% reported to use Spanish 61% to 80% of the time. Conversely, teachers reported that they use English from 40% to 100% of the time. With reference to their perceived level of teaching assignment, 68% reported to have a difficult to very difficult assignments, while only 10% reported to have an easy assignment. With respect to school district support for professional development, 68% reported to have supportive opportunities, while only 16% reported to have unsupportive opportunities. Lastly, 88% reported to be teaching in a lower middle class to poor school community.

An overall profile of the characteristics of the participants classrooms and school districts follows:

Ability level of students:

34% reported low ability
56% reported average ability
10% reported high ability

Percentage of your students for which English is a Second language:

20% reported to have less than 40%
28% reported to have less than 60%
72% reported to have more than 61%

Percentage to the limited English speaking category:

16% reported to have less than 40%
60% reported to have less than 60%
72% reported to have more than 61%

Percentage of Spanish language use to teach:

26% reported to use L1 less than 40%
38% reported to use L1 41% to 60%
28% reported to use L1 61% to 80%
8% reported to use L1 81% to 100%

Percentage of English language use to teach:

32% reported to use L2 less than 40%
52% reported to use L2 41% to 60%
10% reported to use L2 61% to 80%
6% reported to use L2 81% to 100%

Difficulty of teaching assignment:

30% reported to have a very difficult assignment
38% reported to have a very difficult assignment
22% reported to have a very difficult assignment
10% reported to have a very difficult assignment

District support for opportunities for professional development::

68% reported to have supportive opportunities
12% reported to have satisfactory opportunities
16% reported to have unsupportive opportunities
4% reported no opinion

Socioeconomic environment of your school:

4% reported to work in high SES community
6% reported to work in upper middle SES community
52% reported to work in lower middle SES community
36% reported to work in poor SES community
4% reported no opinion

Transfer of Bilingual Inservice

Table II provides the perceptions of the participants (N=50) with regards to the transfer of bilingual inservice. Six questions were asked. The **highest transfer of bilingual inservice** was the "I enhanced my teaching skills" with over 100% agreeing; followed by "I have implemented innovative teaching strategies in my classroom" with 96% agreeing, and with 90% agreeing that "I have more confidence in using new teaching strategies/methodologies." The area receiving the weakest respond was "I become more interested in preparing my teaching lessons" with 66% agreeing. Overall, the transfer of bilingual inservice received high mean scores indicating an area of strength provided by the New Teacher Retention Program.

TABLE II

TRANSFER OF BILINGUAL INSERVICE

Transfer of bilingual inservice occurred as:	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Standard Deviation	Mean
	%	%	%	%		
A. I gained knowledge of new teaching methods	2.0	6.0	68.0	24.0	.60	3.14
B. I enhanced my teaching skills	0.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	.40	3.20
C. I have implemented innovative teaching strategies in my classroom	0.0	4.0	70.0	26.0	.50	3.22
D. I have more confidence in using new teaching strategies/methodology	0.0	10.0	59.6	29.8	.61	3.19
E. I gained interest in new teaching techniques?	0.0	8.0	64.6	27.1	.57	3.18
F. I become more interested in preparing my teaching lessons?	0.0	34.0	46.0	20.0	.73	2.86

Program Opportunities

Table III provides the perceptions of the participants with respect to how the NTRP provided opportunity to the participants to examine and become involve in bilingual classroom practices. The findings indicate that generally the participants felt that, of the sixteen areas of training, thirteen (13) were above the 2.75 rating or close to the agree level. The three highest rated items were participation in peer coaching with a 3.08; analyzed classroom critical incidents with 3.06, and meet and network with peers with 3.04. all at the agree level. None of the items were rated at the strongly agree level, suggesting room for improvement in future activities. The item receiving the lowest rating of 2.12 was the acquisition of new computer skills for the classroom

TABLE IIII

NEW BILINGUAL TEACHER RETENTION PROGRAM OPPORTUNITIES

	Strongly Disagree	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Strongly Agree*	*Standard Deviation*	*Mean*
	%	%	%	%		
A. Participate in teaching demonstrations	8.2	26.5	42.9	22.4	.89	2.79
B. Work in lessons through guided practice	4.1	34.7	40.8	20.4	.82	2.77
C. Participate in independent teaching practice	0.0	37.5	50.0	12.5	.67	2.75
D. Analyze classroom critical incidents	0.0	24.0	46.0	30.0	.74	3.06
E. Participate in peer coaching	4.0	14.0	52.0	30.0	.78	3.08
F. Meet and network with peers	0.0	22.4	51.0	26.5	.71	3.04
G. Visit bilingual classrooms	14.3	26.5	42.9	16.3	.93	2.61
H. Identify my training needs	16.0	28.0	44.0	12.0	.91	2.52
I. Use new teaching approaches	6.7	20.0	60.0	13.3	.76	2.80
J. Develop bilingual teaching materials	4.1	14.3	63.3	18.4	.71	2.96
K. Study and examine case studies of lessons	6.1	18.4	59.2	16.3	.76	2.86
L. Study and examine case studies on classroom management	0.0	17.0	70.2	12.8	.55	2.96
M. Study and examine case studies on discipline	4.1	8.2	73.2	14.3	.63	2.98
N. Receive timely feedback on my teaching	8.0	10.0	76.0	6.0	.67	2.80
P. Study and examine different teaching modalities	10.6	21.3	59.6	8.5	.79	2.66
Q. Acquire new computer skills for classroom use	24.0	42.0	32.0	2.0	.79	2.12

Teaching Methodologies

Table IV provides the perceptions of the participants with regards to teaching methodologies provided to the participants. Specifically, areas related to research, modeling, practice, discussions, improving Spanish speaking skills, motivation to practice, and cooperative learning strategies were the focus of the training. The findings indicate that the most value area was the opportunity to share practice lessons with peers with a rating of 3.06 or "some of the time." None of the other areas were rated above the "some of the time" scale. The lowest area rated was teaching English as a Second Language with a 2.32 rating or very little of the time approaches were provided.

TABLE IV
TRAINING SESSIONS IN TEACHING METHODOLOGIES

Teaching methodologies prrovided participants:	*None of the Time* %	*Very Little Time* %	*Some of the Time* %	*Most of the Time* %	*Standard Deviation*	*Mean*
A. Research showing the effectiveness of the methodology	30.0	1 6.0	44.0	10.0	1.02	2.34
B. Activities modeling the methodolov	0.0	40.8	36.7	22.4	0.78	2.81
C. Practice involving the participants in the methodology	8.2	28.5	53.1	10.2	0.78	2.65
D. Opportunities for teachers to discuss using new teaching methodologies	10.2	20.4	49.0	20.4	0.89	2.79
E. Opportunities to share practice lessons w/ peer	6.0	2.0	72.0	20.0	0.68	3.06
F. Approaches for teaching English as a Second Language	16.3	40.8	36.7	6.1	0.82	2.32
G. Skills for improving your Spanish teaching proficiency	6.1	32.7	51.0	10.2	0.75	2.65
H. Motivation to practice using methodology w/ students before the next inservice session	14.0	24.0	58.0	4.0	0.79	2.52
I. Skills in Coopereative Learning Strategies	8.2	20.4	53.1	18.4	0.83	2.81

Cluster Leader Support

Table V provides the perceptions of the participants with reference to the nature of support provided by the cluster leaders. These leaders were the experienced teachers who serve as mentors to the recently credentialed bilingual teachers. Seven of the eight items received a rating above the "partial support" value. This suggests that the cluster leaders were partially to sufficiently supportive of the participants at least 72% of the time, but had limited time to provide the necessary sufficient support. Specifically, the items receiving the highest mean rating was the cluster leader being a good model of effective teaching strategies with 3.33; followed by a feeling of being involved in implementing inservice learning with 3.28.

Participation in Training Perceived Results.

Table VI provides the perceptions of the participants with regards to their overall development of bilingual skills. Specifically, over 72% of the participants

indicated that they agree to strongly agree that the following skills were enhanced: use of various teaching methodologies, classroom management skills, skills to motivate diverse learners, integrate the social context of their students in their lessons, teaching skills, skills in working with parents, and skills as a bilingual teacher. All of the seven items had a mean rating above 2.75. The highest rated item was the perception of participants that their bilingual teacher skills were enhanced (84% of the participants agree to strongly agree) with a mean rating of 3.02.

TABLE V

NEW BILINGUAL TEACHER RETENTION CLUSTER LEADER SUPPORT

	No Support	*Minimum Support*	*Partial Support*	*Sufficient Support*	*Standard Deviation*	*Mean*
	%	%	%	%		
A. Nurturing in your participation in the inservice program	8.0	18.0	38.0	36.0	0.93	3.02
B. Involved with you in implementing inservice learning	2.0	16.0	36.0	46.0	0.80	3.26
C. Present at the inservice sessions	2.0	26.0	26.0	46.0	0.89	3.16
D. Supportive of you through peer coaching	0.0	20.0	32.0	48.0	0.78	3.28
E. Supportive as a resource person	12.2	12.2	40.8	34.7	0.99	2.98
F. A good model of effective teaching strategies	2.0	8.2	44.9	44.9	0.72	3.33
G. Motivational in holding high standards for linguistically diverse students	0.0	18.4	44.9	36.7	0.73	3.18
H. Effective in matching student needs with teaching strategy	0.0	16.7	56.3	27.1	0.66	3.10

TABLE VI

PARTICIPATION IN NEW BILINGUAL TEACHER RETENTION PROGRAM RESULTS

	Strongly Disagree	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Strongly Agree*	*Standard Deviation*	*Mean*
	%	%	%	%		
A. Developing your use of various teaching methodologies	6.1	20.4	46.9	26.5	0.85	2.93
B. Enhancing your classroom management skills	6.0	22.0	50.0	22.0	0.82	2.88
C. Enhancing your skills to motivate diverse learners	4.0	6.0	78.0	12.0	0.59	2.98
D. Integrating the social context of students to your lessons	4.1	28.6	55.1	12.2	0.72	2.75
E. Improvements in your teaching skills	6.0	12.0	72.0	10.0	0.67	2.86
F. Enhancing your skills to work with parents	6.0	12.0	64.0	18.0	0.74	2.94
G. Enhancing your skills as a bilingual teacher	6.0	10.0	60.0	24.0	0.77	3.02

Correlations of Selected Variables

Further analysis of selected variables was undertaken using Pearson Product Movement Correlation Coefficient calculations. A correlation coefficient compares the variation in one variable to the variation in another variable. The last category of the Survey Instrument was chosen given that it addresses the participants' agreement to which the "participation in the program has resulted in" the development of seven selected skills. **Table VII provides a correlation coefficient matrix of variables associated with participation in the New Teacher retention program. While the matrix indicates that a large number of variables were significant at the .05 and .01 level, only those above the .60 to 1.00 level are discussed.** The .60 to .79 correlation coefficient indicates a level of significance that has a moderate to marked relationship between variables; while a .80 to 1.00 correlation coefficient indicates a high dependable relationship.

The matrix of correlation coefficients in Table VII suggests that the variables that are associated with participation in the program correlated at the moderate(lowest being .6063) to the high dependable levels (highest being .9292). Specifically, these variables are "developing your use of various teaching methodologies," "enhancing your classroom management skills," "enhancing your skills to motivate diverse learners," "integrating the social context of your students to your lessons," "improvements in your teaching skills," "enhancing your skills to work with parents," and "enhancing your skills as a bilingual teacher."

The variable "**developing your use of various teaching methodologies**" (PRA) correlated with four variables at the moderate level and and one at the high dependable level, all at the .01 level of significance. **These variables are**: with sessions in teaching methodologies that provided "activities in modeling methodologies" with a coefficient of .6172, and "skills for improving your Spanish proficiency" with a coefficient of .6172; with the support provided by the cluster leader as "a good model for effective teaching strategies" with a coefficient of .7143, "motivational in holding high standards for linguistically diverse students' with a coefficient of .6918, and "effective in

matching student needs with teaching strategy" with a high dependable coefficient of .8806.

The variable **"enhancing your classroom management skills"** (PRB) correlated with six variables at the moderate level, all at the .01 level of significance. These variables are associated with transfer of bilingual skills occurred as "I enhanced my teaching skills" with a coefficient of .6864; opportunity to "participate in teaching demonstrations" with a coefficient of .6409; cluster leader support in being "present at the inservice sessions" with a coefficient of .6117, being a "a good model of effective teaching strategies" with a coefficient of .6256, being an "effective in matching student needs with teaching strategy" with a coefficient of .6537; and lastly with "developing your use of various teaching strategies" with a coefficient of .6063.

The variable **"enhancing your skills to motivate diverse learners"** (PRC) correlated with two variables at the high dependable level, all at the .01 level of significance. These variables are associated with "developing your use of various teaching strategies" with a coefficient of .7378, and "enhancing your classroom management skills" with a coefficient of .7101.

The variable **"integrating the social context of your students to your lessons"** (PRD) correlated with eight variables at the moderate and one at high dependable level, all at the .01 level of significance. These variables are associated with "I have implemented innovative teaching strategies in my classroom" with a coefficient of .6035; and opportunity to "use new teaching approaches" with a coefficient of .7015; teaching methodologies that provided "research showing the effectiveness of the methodology" with a coefficient of .6938, "activities modeling methodology" with a coefficient of .7003, "approaches for teaching English as a second language" with a coefficient of .7348; cluster leader provided support that was "nurturing in your participation in the inservice program" with a coefficient of .6784; participation in the program related to" developing your use of various teaching methodologies" with a coefficient of .6894, "enhancing your classroom management skills" with a coefficient of .6418, and "enhancing your skills to motivate diverse learners" with a coefficient of .7153.

The variable **"improvements in your teaching skills"** (PRE) correlated with eight variables at the moderate and three at high dependable level, all at the .01 level of significance. These variables are related to opportunity to "participate in teaching demonstrations" with a coefficient of .6427; teaching methodologies that provided "research showing the effectiveness of the methodology" with a coefficient of .6366, "activities modeling the methodology" with a coefficient of .6184; cluster leader support in the form of being "present at the inservice sessions" with a coefficient of .6891, being "a good model of effective teaching strategies" with a coefficient of .6547, "motivational in holding high standards for linguistically diverse students" with a coefficient of .6050, "effective in matching student needs with teaching strategy" with a coefficient of .7414. The last four variables are associated with participation in the program related to "developing your use of various teaching methodologies" with a coefficient of .7433, "enhancing your classroom management skills" with a coefficient of .8186, and "enhancing your skills to motivate diverse learners" with a coefficient of .8202, and "integrating the social context of your students to your lessons" with a coefficient of .8213.

The variable **"enhancing your skills to work with parents"** (PRF) correlated with ten variables at the moderate and two at high dependable level, all at the .01 level of significance. These variables are related to opportunity "participate in teaching demonstrations" with a coefficient of .7017, "participate in independent teaching practice" with a coefficient of .6427; opportunity to "develop bilingual teaching materials" with a coefficient of .7059; cluster leader support in being "present at the inservice sessions" with a coefficient of .7286, being "a good model of effective teaching strategies" with a coefficient of .6975, "motivational in holding high standards for linguistically diverse students" with a coefficient of .6348, "effective in matching student needs with teaching strategy" with a coefficient of .6535. The last five variables are associated with participation in the program related to "developing your use of various teaching methodologies" with a coefficient of .6813, "enhancing your classroom management skills" with a coefficient of .8582, and "enhancing your

Table VII
Correlation Coefficient Matrix of Variables Associated With Participation in the New Teacher Retention Program

	PRA	PRB	PRC	PRD	PRE	PRF	PRG
TRGA	.3368*	.1490	.2274	.2588	.2186	.2007	.1956
TRGB	.3442*	.0856	.2284	.2728	.1932	.0859	.1197
TRGC	.1032	-.2402	-.1169	-.0666	-.0093	-.1583	-.3032
TRFA	.1370	.4018**	.0632	.2149	.3002*	.4285**	.2564
TRFB	.2170	.6864**	.4462**	.3150*	.4822**	.5871**	.6436**
TRFC	.3195*	.5532**	.4940**	.6035**	.5732**	.5259**	.5122**
TRGD	.3635*	.5893**	.4199**	.3946**	.4777**	.5380**	.5724**
TRGE	.3675*	.1497	.3217*	.5276**	.3441*	.1758	.0966
TRFF	.5175**	.5152**	.4215**	.5644**	.5857**	.4005**	.4421**
OPPA	.5056**	.6409**	.5434**	.5034**	.6427**	.7017**	.7599**
OPPB	.2771	.5062**	.2883*	.2301	.3151*	.4512**	.5610**
OPPC	. 939	.5487**	.3575*	.2743	.5236**	.6427**	.5776**
OPPD	-.0594	.3133*	.0028	.2357	.2642	.3796**	.2131
OPPE	.1632	.3653**	.1372	-.0374	.1784	.2566	.3041*
OPPF	-.1344	.0441	-.0972	.1570	.1432	.1233	-.0016
OPPG	-.0043	-.1163	-.0898	.0699	-.0566	-.1545	-.0464
OPPH	.2813	.3302*	.3631**	.5471**	.4569**	.2901*	.2476
OPPI	.3906**	-.0328	.2413	.7015**	.3953**	.0870	.0276
OPPJ	.3769**	.7713**	.5438**	.3885**	.5979**	.7059**	.6473**
OPPK	.3386*	.2013	.4062**	.5766**	.4029**	.1668	.2156
OPPL	.2723	.1772	.1304	.4250**	.4631**	.4220**	.1526
OPPM	.3088*	.4727**	.3331*	.4935**	.5803**	.5292**	.2993*
OPPN	.1949	.4361**	.3518*	.3371*	.4816**	.4693**	.3644**
OPPP	-.2201	.1446	-.0010	-.0956	.0399	.2004	.0228
OPPQ	.4084**	.2393	.2656	.3337*	.2987*	.3232*	.2949*
TMOA	.3801**	.3158*	.4863**	.6938**	.6366**	.4862**	.3026*
TMOB	.6397**	.3488*	.5293**	.7003**	.6184**	.5151**	.4178**
TMOC	.5642**	.3138*	.5692**	.5852**	.5759**	.4639**	.3563*
TMOD	-.0116	-.0291	.1101	.4231**	.2385	.0826	-.0489
TMOE	.1839	.1945	.2063	.2398	.2864*	.2902*	.2699
TMOF	.5322**	.3622*	.5649**	.7348**	.5692**	.4041**	.4437**
TMOG	.6172**	.5635**	.4034**	.5373**	.5558**	.5549**	.5476**
TMOH	.0780	.1294	.3306*	.5504**	.3721**	.1945	.1507
TMOI	.1599	-.0931	.2444	.4199**	.2848*	.1153	.0584
CLSA	.1050	.2676	.1488	.3442*	.2971*	.296 3*	.2823*
CLSB	.3559*	.4180**	.1838	.1843	.3343*	.370 2**	.4339**
CLSC	.4220**	.6117**	.4742**	.5623**	.6891**	.728 6**	.6520**
CLSD	.4597**	.4956**	.3221*	.2272	.4259**	.452 1**	.4647**
CLSE	.2457	.4775**	.2471	.3432*	.5243**	.533 6**	.4071**
CLSF	.7143**	.6256**	.4547**	.5172**	.6547**	.697 5**	.6596**
CLSG	.6918**	.5201**	.3463*	.4430**	.6050**	.634 8**	.4360**
CLSH	.8806**	.6337**	.5955**	.6784**	.7414**	.6535**	.6682**
PRA	1.0000	.6062**	.7378**	.6894**	.7403**	.6813**	.6630**
PRB		1.0000	.7101**	.6418**	.8136**	.8582**	.8733**
PRC			1.0000	.7153**	.8202**	.7469**	.7673**
PRD				1.0000	.8213**	.7046**	.6399**
PRE					1.0000	.9292**	.8368**
PRF						1.0000	.8630**
PRG							1.0000

* - Signif. LE .05 ** - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)

skills to motivate diverse learners" with a coefficient of .7469, and "integrating the social context of your students to your lessons" with a coefficient of .7046, and "improvements in your teaching skills" with a coefficient of .9292.

The variable **"enhancing your skills as a bilingual teacher"** (PRG) correlated with ten variables at the moderate and four at high dependable level, all at the .01 level of significance. These variables are associated with the transfer of bilingual training a "I enhanced my teaching skills" with a coefficient of.6436; opportunity to "participate in teaching demonstrations" with a coefficient of .7599, "developing bilingual materials" with a coefficient of .6473; cluster leader support in being "present at the inservice sessions" with a coefficient of .6520, being a "good model of effective teaching strategies' with a coefficient of .6596, "effective in matching student needs with teaching strategy" with a coefficient of .6682. The last six variables are associated with participation in the program related to "developing your use of various teaching methodologies" with a coefficient of .6630, "enhancing your classroom management skills" with a coefficient of .8733, and "enhancing your skills to motivate diverse learners" with a coefficient of .7673, and "integrating the social context of your students to your lessons" with a coefficient of .6399, "improvements in your teaching skills" with a coefficient of .8368, and "enhancing your skills to work with parents" with a coefficient of .8630.

Part 4: Increase Teacher Retention

To determine what suggestions and/or impressions the participants had with respect to the **strengths and weaknesses of the NTRP** specific open ended questions the Title VII Bilingual Teacher Program Survey and Evaluation of New Bilingual Teacher Program (see Appendix A and B) were analyzed. These sections directly addressed the strengths weaknesses and derived benefits of the NTRP.

WHAT DO YOU FEEL WERE SOME OF THE STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM?

- The sharing of ideas. This entire program is an excellent idea. It is a pretty strong program. Great support from others, the program was motivational and inspiring. "I sure wish it was around my first year: The opportunity

to share ideas and ask for help in "crisis" situations, I believe the program was great. Outside speakers/presentations seemed very helpful to the new teachers."

- New teachers need time to meet and "bond" with other new and experienced teachers. This program provided outstanding guest speakers, as they demonstrated their techniques with students.

- I enjoyed all of the "hands-on" workshops. I feel new teachers need materials and ideas.

- "Make It Take it Workshop" very valuable and practical-direct application to classroom.

- The presentations on teaching strategies that I could go to school and experience them. Getting practical ideas for use in classroom.

- Many of the problems I encountered during my first year were dealt with. The opportunity to share experiences and frustrations. Speaking with many knowledgeable people on various topics. Time to compare notes with colleagues. Meeting with peers and I'm not the only one with problems. Thinking up ways to solve problems, sharing ideas.

- The most valuable speakers to me were the "Whole Language Approach." I learned so much. Seminar presentations on "Whole Language." When the literature unit was introduced, how to implement it. The Integrated Language speakers were excellent and relative to my needs. The cooperative learning seminars were helpful.

- Discussions on critical incidents. The flexibility of class attendance; the warmth and support one feels when attending this class, not only from the cluster leaders, but from the other teachers as well.

- I feel the most beneficial aspect of this program has been the time we've spent together and the bond we've built among the members from our own district. I also feel that we've benefitted from the connections with other districts. I think we've really learned from each other.

- The basic idea of a support system is valuable, and I enjoyed meeting people experiencing similar situations to mine. Classroom resources was also very valuable.

- The cluster leaders are excellent resource people. I liked getting into groups and sharing grade level ideas. Much of the advice was very helpful. I really enjoyed being able to talk with my peers and leaders about my class to get ideas. The experiences from each other during our discussions. The open communication that led to great discussions about similar problems we could relate to.

- Peer and leader support!!

WHAT DO YOU FEEL WERE WEAKNESSES IN THE PROGRAM?

- During some of the discussion groups, perhaps certain topics could have been assigned the previous week to be discused and items shared the following week. There seemed to be some confusion among teachers in my group as to the nature of assignments and or due dates not always, just occasionally. Also, the half hour "sharing" might have been structural a bit more - perhaps one or two grade level teachers designated as "sharers" for the week, providing copies to all others in the group.

- Assigned papers were never clearly explained. The case studies!! Case studies caused stress and were burden for new teachers. When receiving guidelines for our case studies they should be clear. More information needs to be given as to how to prepare a case study and how it would be evaluated. Deadlines seemed to change also. When a deadline is given it should not be changed! A unit would be more relevant to our teaching needs and goals.

- Organization and logistics of training. This program has been quite successful, but with little more effort being placed in organization I see it really improving. A lot of time was wasted! Some people not being on time and the presenters having to start late. More efficient notification of changes and cancellations of meetings. It seemed a bit disorganized. Dates changed, not having a set meeting time, lack of clear instruction for case studies.

- Each district had some needs that were unique and needed to be addressed with resources from within that district. Some flexibility in scheduling inservices for those particular needs would be great.

- Some speakers. At times I felt the discussions were too lengthy. I feel some of the presentations covered too much materials, concentrate on just one lesson for just one subject from beginning to end.

- There was not enough time to visit the classrooms you would like to visit.

- The cluster groups were useful, but I would have liked for our leader to have visited my class more often and received feedback on teaching method, classroom management, etc. Too much discussion in cluster groups. It seemed like the critical incidents are not too critical. "I think I could have more useful information by having my leader visit my class and see how I handle things and then have him/her give me feedback for improvement. It is still hard to work two ELEPS groups, three reading groups and computer rotations all day long."

Part 5: Future New Teacher Retention Program Suggestions

Using the TITLE VII BILINGUAL TEACHER PROGRAM SURVEY (see Appendix B and Appendix F for a complete list of responses), two questions were asked of the participants. For each of the questions summary cluster responses are provided:

BECAUSE OF THE NEW TEACHER RETENTION PROGRAM I WAS ABLE TO:

- Reflect upon my lessons/class management

- Make it through my first year!! Decide that our model of bilingual education was not effective and that I prefer English only as an alternative.

- I was able to get specific answers to my questions as they applied to my classroom.

- Became aware of methodologies.

- Share with others common concerns

- Learn different strategies to teaching LEP children. Also learned how to deal with behavioral incidents.

- Receive support that was necessary in my first year teaching.

- Have an opportunity to share practice lessons with peers.

- Use new teaching approaches and I was also able to meet other bilingual teachers.

- Discuss issues of bilingual education with other teachers from my district. Also I was able to network.

- Understand many strategies of teaching and learned things from peers and our leaders.

- Improve and refine teaching skills and strategies

- I was able to talk with other teachers and share some common experiences and problem solve difficulty.

- Consult with my fellow peers on classroom management skills.

- Develop lessons using lots of visuals for children.

WHAT WOULD YOU CHANGE OR RECOMMEND TO MAKE FUTURE NEW BILINGUAL TEACHER RETENTION PROGRAM MORE EFFECTIVE?

- A more structured program and more training through practice. Emphasize classroom discipline, classroom manegement, stress techniques, how to detect learning disabilities, how to set up your classroom and learning centers, organizational skills, setting up a folder for non-bilingual substitute, and the preparation of cum files, report cards, open house, etc.
- Use mentor teachers to demonstrate model lessons for new teachers in various subject areas.

- Emphasize on finding a "buddy system with another teacher and keep in touch with each other.

- More effective bilingual curriculum be provided to the classroom teacher to ease the burden of double preparation without double pay.

- More classroom visits and peer observation of bilingual classrooms for individual help.

- Use it as more of a resource for teachers to share ideas and make up material appropriate to grade level. Have more time to do "make it projects." Provide more bilingual resources.

- More methodology training and less sharing of strategies. Case studies and critical incidents are useful but should not be a major emphasis. Less discussion more practice.

- Maybe hold the meetings in different teachers' classrooms --to receive some additional ideas and to visit more bilingual classrooms.

- Have the participants visit several bilingual classrooms and spend one day in the classrooms and one day in the classroom of the cluster leader. Meeting with cluster leaders should be more brainstorming.

- The program was set-up in a lecture style. It should change to require more participation to model more effective teaching strategies.

- Invite more specialized speakers to speak about current educational issues.

- More classroom visits from cluster leaders; a classroom visit to cluster leader's classroom, and sit and plan a week's lesson plans to manage Spanish/English groups. More time and preparation with cluster leaders.

- More time on teacher responsibilities, district procedures, expectations, initiating change. Teacher input from each grade level on the surprises one finds when going through the curriculum for the first time.

- Emphasize make-it and take-it workshops and subject matter/content specific workshops. More time to develop materials. The things that were more classroom oriented and hands-on are the things one retains the longest.

- More clarity and guidance on written assignments and training expectations, case studies and development on unit lessons.

Section IV

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This section provides the salient findings of Teacher Retention Program and implications for future training. Specifically, seven points summarized the evaluation.

1. The project at the end of its three year period conceptualized, implemented and infused its training design into the Multiple Subjects Bilingual Emphasis Credential Program at SDSU/College of Education;

2. The project influenced the training coordinators of the six cooperating school districts to provide support training to newly hired credentialed teachers.

3. The cluster leader was found to have played a significant role in nurturing teacher participation; implementing trainings; supportive in peer coaching; modeling effective teaching strategies; being motivational in holding high standards for students, and effective in matching student needs with teaching strategies.

4. The project initiated an ongoing dialogue with the bilingual teacher education programs about the mutual cooperation and support to newly credentialed bilingual teachers.

5. The participating teachers in the NTRP indicated growth in their professional development through the training received in selected areas of professional growth. **Specifically, areas of highest growth were**:

- Transfer of bilingual new teaching methods.
- Transfer of bilingual teaching skills.
- Transfer of innovative teaching strategies in the classroom.
- Transfer in using new teaching strategies and methodologies.
- Interest in new teaching techniques.

- Meeting and networking with peers.
- Opportunities to share and practice lessons with peers.
- Enhancing skills as a bilingual teacher.

The areas of least perceived growth were:

- Written assignments related to case studies and critical incidents.
- Acquiring new computer skills for classroom use.
- Using research to show the effectiveness of teaching methodologies.
- Approaches for teaching English as a Second language.

6. Analysis of the data using correlation coefficients suggests that the variables that are associated with **participation in the program** had the strongest correlations, at the moderate(lowest being .6063) to the high dependable levels (highest being .9292). Specifically, these variables are "developing your use of various teaching methodologies," "enhancing your classroom management skills," "enhancing your skills to motivate diverse learners," "integrating the social context of your students to your lessons," "improvements in your teaching skills," "enhancing your skills to work with parents," and "enhancing your skills as a bilingual teacher."

The variable "**developing your use of various teaching methodologies**," was correlated with varaibles associated with activities modeling methodology and with the cluster leader modeling effective teaching strategies, being motivational in holding high standards for lingustically diverse students, and in providing skills to improve Spanish teaching proficiency.

The variable "**enhancing your classroom management skills**," was correlated with variables that provided opportunity to participate in teaching demonstrations, cluster leader modeling effective teaching strategies, and developing use of various teaching methodologies.

The variable "**enhancing your skills to motivate diverse learners**," was correlated with variables related to developing use of various teaching strategies and enhancing classroom management skills.

The variable "**integrating the social context of your students to your lessons,**" was correlated with variables associated with implementing innovative teaching strategies in the classroom; opportunity to use new teaching approaches; cluster leader involvement in training, as well as modeling effective teaching strategies; holding high standards for diverse learners; and effective in matching student needs with teaching strategy. As well as with the variables related to developing use of various teaching strategies, classroom management, and skills to motivate diverse learners.

The variable "**improvements in your teaching skills,**" was correlated with variables related to opportunity to participate in teaching demonstrations, research showing the effectiveness of the methodology, modeling, and cluster leader presence in the inservice, as well as modeling, holding high standards for diverse learners and matching student needs with teaching strategy.

The variable "**enhancing your skills to work with parents**" was correlated with two variables associated with "improvements in your teaching skills" plus "opportunity to develop bilingual teaching materials."

The variable "**enhancing your skills as a bilingual teacher**" was correlated with variables addressing the transfer of bilingual inservice, opportunity to participate in teaching demonstrations and developing bilingual materials, and cluster leader support as a model of effective teaching strategies, holding high standards, and matching students needs with teaching strategy.

7. Lastly, due to the training received in the NTRP, the participating teachers agreed that their skills were upgraded and that their projected career plans were fostered and enhanced as bilingual teachers.

The findings have also six significant implications to the training of bilingual personnel.

1. School districts will continue to place more request for services for carrying out supplementary training for new bilingual teachers given the

increased number of LEP students and placement of school assignments.

2. In California the same trend as in 1987-91, will continue in the 1990's with respect to the growing population of ethnolinguistic students and the reduction of school districts' resources for staff development. **Fewer classroom teachers are being supported to participate in the long term staff development** activities. Thus, there is the need to create and provide recently credentialed bilingual teachers with training using different delivery modes or formats.

3. There is a growing request for improving instruction for at-risk LEP students at the K-12 level. Coupled with the serious **underachievement of LEP and FEP students** is the need to actively engage teachers and parents in the education of LEP students.

4. The need for **first and second language acquisition theory and methodology** will continue to be a priority for recently hired or new school personnel working with ethnolinguistic students.

5. There is a need for bilingual programs to further develop instructional approaches and quality of instructional materials in the primary language in order to **improve classroom teacher skills and materials** in the basic academic content areas of reading, math, science and the social sciences.

6. The findings of this evaluation suggests a number of areas for new bilingual teachers to acquire and develop as they work with limited English speaking students in California and the nation:

- Understanding of school organizational procedures
- Organizational skills in the bilingual classroom
- Discipline and communication strategies.
- Management of bilingual classroom.
- Language Acquisition Theory and Application, K-8 and 7-12
- Cooperative Learning Structures
- Spanish Language Arts K-12
- Whole Language Classrooms and Instruction
- Parent Leadership Training
- Parent Home-School Collaboration
- English Language Development
- Second Language Acquisition
- Shelter English Instruction
- Cultural Diversity and Classroom Strategies
- Change Strategies and Bilingual Instruction
- Multicultural Instruction and Social Studies

Future Training Needs

The growth in the State's non-English language speaking population, from 567,564 (1986) to 861,531 (1990), has taken place at the same time when the State bilingual education law reached its statutes of limitation in 1977 -- Assembly Bill (AB 507); as well as the State's voting populace passed a state constitutional amendment establishing English as the official language in California. California state policy for educating its language minority LEP students will essentially continue to be guided by federal guidelines and the basic requirements of the former California law. School districts in California are thus required to ensure that the LEP student populations are provided with equal opportunities for developing their English language proficiencies and improving achievement in the basic academic content areas. The instructional personnel assigned and responsible for educating these students will continue to be required to meet state bilingual credentialing and certification standards. With the exception of the requirements associated with teachers on waiver (non-bilingual personnel), districts will need to comply with the basic requirements of the former statute in order to comply with federal policy under Castañeda v. Pickard (1981). Such guidelines require that schools provide educational sound instructional approaches based on pedagogical research, allocate the necessary resources to provide such instruction (staff, curriculum, resources), and document the effectiveness of such instructional approaches.

Bibliography

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the Twenty-first Century. New York: The Forum, (1986).

Carnegie Council. (1989). Turning points: Preparing American youth for the 21st century. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development.

Commission for Teacher Credentialing. (1988). Annual Report. Sacramento: California State Department of Education.

Espinosa, R. and Ochoa, A. (1992). The Educational Attainment of California Youth: A Public Equity Crisis. SDSU> Policy Studies Department.

Gold, N. (1989). Demographics for California Through the End of the Century. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education.

Holmes Group., Tomorrow's Teachers. East Lansing, Mich: Holmes Group.

Suarez- Orozco, M. (1989). In Pursuit of a Dream: New Hispanic Immigrants in American Schools. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Trueba, H. (1989). Raising silent voices: Educating the Linguistic Minorities for the 21st Century. New York: Harper & Row.

APPENDICES

October 12, 1991

Dear Bilingual Training Recipient:

We need your help in completing our final evaluation report to the U.S. Office of Education Your input will be treated as confidential.

We are seeking your insights/opinions. Because you have participated in the SDSU Title VII New Bilingual Teacher Retention Program during FY 1989-1991 training activities, you have been selected to respond to our survey. Attached you will find the survey and a self-stamped envelope.

The information will be analyzed to determine the impact of the training your received through the project.

Your attention to our request is highly valued and we appreciate your assistance. If you have any questions regarding the survey, please let us know (619) 594-5193.

Sincerely,

Alberto Ochoa
Evaluator

EVAL A-1
AMO/mep

Enc.

Title VII Bilingual Survey

This questionnaire is a tool for assessing your opinions and level of satisfaction as a past participant of the Title VII New Bilingual Teacher Retention Programan. You are asked to indicate what is important in promoting the transfer of inservice skills and knowledge to the bilingual classroom. Thank you very much for your cooperation and assistance.

Please check or insert your best opinion

1. *Sex:* M_____ F_____

2. *Age:* _____*18-24,* _____*24-30,* _____*31-40,* _____*40+*

3. *Years of teaching:*_____ *Grade level (s)*_____

4. Institution you received teacher training?_____

   Ability level of your students: *Low* _____ *High*
   1 2 3 4 5

5. *Percentage of your students for which English is a second language:* _____

6. *Of these, what percentage belong to these categories:*

   Not fluent:_____% Limited fluency: _____% Fluent_____%

7. *Which languages do you use to teach?* L1_____ % of time
   (If more than one indicate percentage of time) L2_____ % of time

8. *How difficult is your teaching assignment?*
   Very Difficult _____ *Very Easy*
   1 2 3 4 5

9. *Please classify your school's personnel regarding opportunities for professional development:*

   Supportive _____% Neutral_____% Unsupportive_____%

10. *Please indicate the socioeconomic environment of your school:*

    Rich_____% Upper middle class_____% Lower middle class_____% Poor_____%

11. *Please indicate approximately how many inservice training activities you attended in the <u>New Bilingual Teacher Retention Program</u>:*

    _____A. How many training activities did you participate in?
    _____B. Of these activities, how many were required attendance?
    _____C. How many were your own choice?

12. *Transfer of bilingual inservice occurred as:*	*Strongly Disagree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Strongly Agree*
A. I gained knowledge of new teaching methods	1	2	3	4
B. I enhanced my teaching skills	1	2	3	4
C. I have implemented innovative teaching strategies in my classroom	1	2	3	4
D. I have more confidence in using new teaching strategies/methodology	1	2	3	4
E. I gained interest in new teaching techniques?	1	2	3	4
F. I become more interested in preparing my teaching lessons?	1	2	3	4

13. The New Bilingual Teacher Retention Program provided opportunity to:	*Strongly Disagree*	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Strongly Agree*
A. Participate in teaching demonstrations	1	2	3	4
B. Work in lessons through guided practice	1	2	3	4
C. Participate in independent teaching practice	1	2	3	4
D. Analyze classroom critical incidents	1	2	3	4
E. Participate in peer coaching	1	2	3	4
F. Meet and network with peers	1	2	3	4
G. Visit bilingual classrooms	1	2	3	4
H. Identify my training needs	1	2	3	4
I. Use new teaching approaches	1	2	3	4
J. Develop bilingual teaching materials	1	2	3	4
K. Study and examine case studies of lessons	1	2	3	4
L. Study and examine case studies on classroom management	1	2	3	4
M. Study and examine case studies on discipline	1	2	3	4
N. Receive timely feedback on my teaching	1	2	3	4
P. Study and examine different teaching modalities	1	2	3	4
Q. Acquire new computer skills for classroom use	1	2	3	4

14. *Sessions in teaching methodologies offered to participants provided:*	*None of the Time*	*Very Little Time*	*Some of the Time*	*Most of the Time*
A. Research showing the effectiveness of the methodology	1	2	3	4
B. Activities modeling the methodology	1	2	3	4
C. Practice involving the participants in the methodology	1	2	3	4
D. Opportunities for teachers to discuss using new teaching methodologies	1	2	3	4
E. Opportunities to share practice lessons with peer	1	2	3	4
F. Approaches for teaching English as a Second Language	1	2	3	4
G. Skills for improving your Spanish teaching proficiency	1	2	3	4
H. Motivation to practice using methodology with students before the next inservice session	1	2	3	4
I. Skills in Coopereative Learning Strategies	1	2	3	4

15. *Your New Bilingual Teacher Retention Program cluster leader provided* ***support*** *that was:*

	No Support	*Minimum Support*	*Partial Support*	*Sufficient Support*
A. Nurturing in your participation in the inservice program	1	2	3	4
B. Involved with you in implementing inservice learning	1	2	3	4
C. Present at the inservice sessions	1	2	3	4
D. Supportive of you through peer coaching	1	2	3	4
E. Supportive as a resource person	1	2	3	4
F. A good model of effective teaching strategies	1	2	3	4
G. Motivational in holding high standards for linguistically diverse students	1	2	3	4
H. Effective in matching student needs with teaching strategy	1	2	3	4

16. *Your participation in the program has resulted in:*

	Strongly Disagree	*Disagree*	*Agree*	*Strongly Agree*
A. Developing your use of various teaching methodologies	1	2	3	4
B. Enhancing your classroom management skills	1	2	3	4
C. Enhancing your skills to motivate diverse learners	1	2	3	4
D. Integrating the social context of your students to your lessons	1	2	3	4
E. Improvements in your teaching skills	1	2	3	4
F. Enhancing your skills to work with parents	1	2	3	4
G. Enhancing your skills as a bilingual teacher	1	2	3	4

18. Because of the New Teacher retention program I was able to ?

_____

_____

19. What would you change or recommend to make future New Bilingual Teacher Retention Program more effective?

_____

_____

20. Other comments:

_____

_____

_____

EVALUATION OF NEW BILINGUAL TEACHER PROGRAM

Would you please rate each of the following aspects of the program:

	little value		moderate value		very useful
1. Presentations by speakers					
2. Discussions on critical incidents					
3. Preparation of case studies					
4. Meetings with cluster leaders					
5. Classroom visits					
6. Meeting with peers					
7. Course credit					
8. Relevance of program to my professional growth					
9. Utility of program for my classroom					
10. Developing a network with other					

What do you feel were some of the strengths of the program?

What do you feel were weaknesses in the program?

We would appreciate your comments on how to improve the program for next year. Now that you have survived your first year of teaching, you might specifically note problems you have encountered, frustrations, areas of training where you needed to know more, area where support would have been useful, etc.

Again, based upon your first year's experience, what do you feel should have obviously been taught in your preservice and student teaching programs?

NEW TEACHER RETENTION PROJECT

Building a Case Study

II. Classroom Management and Discipline

A. In your journal, review your management strategies and approach.

B. Compare them to the ideas presented in the seminar of 29 September 1987. How are they similar or different?

C. Of the strategies and materials suggested at the seminar, which ones have you tried? How well have they worked? Why or why not?

D. How have you changed or adapted the approaches and suggestions from that seminar? Explain why you made that adaptation.

E. From the strategies and suggestions presented at the seminar, are there any you think would be inappropriate to use in your class? Explain why.

F. What kind of information or assistance will help you continue to grow professionally in this area?

NEW TEACHER RETENTION PROJECT
DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. What are the elements of a lesson?
   a. Purpose, goal, objective
   b. Activities, events with a structure or focus (means for getting to purpose)
   c. Materials
   d. People: interactions among them
      1) ideas about content
      2) general dimensions: courtesy, routines, norms, discipline
   e. Content, subject matter
2. Characterize how each element is portrayed in this lesson. Be careful not to make judgments, statements, or to read too much into this lesson.
3. With which elements do you think there are problems? Identify what you think they are.
4. What is successful in this lesson?
5. Formulate a solution to the problem in management and discipline related interactions.
6. Did you consider the context information you were provided in formulating your solution? How is this information helpful and how could it be potentially misleading or misapplied in trying to solve this problem?
7. What other contextual information would be helpful to know in solving this problem?
8. What about the teacher's own values, beliefs and attitudes and perspective would be important to take into account in addressing this problem? What possible stereotypes are operating in this situation?
9. What other sources of information would be worthwhile to consider solving this this problem?
10. How does the discipline problem and the other elements relate to each other?

3. Interpersonal relations

Include a rationale for the strategy you used in this success; why you chose that strategy over others; what school, community, student, curricular factors influenced your decision. What, if anything, influenced this success that you hadn't planned for or anticipated? What did you learn from this success that you can use in the future? What did you learn from this about yourself, your own knowledge and skills?

B. Describe and explain a less-than-successful occurrence in each of the areas listed in A above. Use the same questions to develop your narrative.

What knowledge, skills, sensitivity, resources would have helped you in this situation? What would be some better ways to handle this situation should it occur again? What do you know bout how others have handled similar problems?

NEW TEACHER RETENTION PROJECT
Second Assignment - Alternative 2
Due: 12 April 1988

Read the attached lesson transcript, then answer the following questions, using a separate sheet of paper for your answers:

1. Was there a single main topic or a set of related topics in this lesson? What were they?

2. What were the main concepts or ideas of this lesson?

3. What instructional approach and strategies were used?

4. Evaluate the appropriateness of the approach used for the topic, for this group of students.

5. How much do you think the students already know about the topic of this lesson? Explain the basis for your answer. Are you making an inference, citing evidence from the lesson, or both?

6. Did the teacher assume the students knew more than they actually did know? Explain.

7. What are some things the teacher did in this lesson that you would caution him not to do? Explain why you would caution him in these areas.

NEW TEACHER RETENTION PROJECT
Third Assignment
Due: 3 May 1988

Review, analyze and evaluate the attached lesson.

Include consideration of the following issues:

In what ways does this lesson represent good instructional practice in mathematics education?

In what ways does it represent poor practice?

What philosophy of mathematics education is represented in this lesson?

In what ways is this lesson similar or dissimilar to your own teaching of mathematics? What in mathematics do you teach differently?

Explain your answers. Use what you understand from Bezuk's Arithmetic Teacher article and what you learn in the 19 April seminar as, at least, partial reference.

CHART III
CASE REPORT ASSESSMENT PROTOCOL BASED ON SHULMAN'S MODEL OF PEDAGOGICAL REASONING AND ACTION

Comprehension What does the case report suggest about the quality of the teacher's understanding of the content of instruction? Is there any evidence of structural understanding, or how the specific learning being focused on is related to other ideas in the content area? Is there any evidence that the teacher recognizes students' misconceptions and is able to help students correct them? Does the teacher show evidence of ability to assist students in making connections between ideas within a content area and between content areas? Similarly what level of comprehension of pedagogy and pedagogical purposes are evidenced in the teacher's case report?

Transformation What evidence is provided to suggest that the teacher knows how to present and represent content to students in ways that are meaningful to them? What, if any, analogies, metaphors or other symbolic representations are incorporated by the teacher in her/his instructional plan? What evidence is there that the teacher has devised a plan for using strategies and materials appropriate to both the learners and learnings? What evidence is there that the teacher has anticipated limitations of materials and strategies to be used?

Instruction Does the analysis of the interactions reflect an understanding and interpretation of the dynamic interaction of students, teacher, materials, strategies, ideas, prior learnings, backgrounds, etc.?

Evaluation Upon what evidence does the teacher evaluate the success of the lesson or experience? Is reference made to student work, attitudes, behaviors, the teacher's technical competence? Are the measures related to the intentions?

Reflection To what combination of factors does the teacher refer in reflecting on the episode? Does the teacher suggest an interpretation of how factors related in producing either a success or lesser-than-ideal? Does the teacher consider issues related to broader educational purposes or limit to technical implementation level concerns? Does the teacher relate her his work to any philosophical or theoretical orientations, or to any body of research?

New Comprehension What evidence is there in the case report that the teacher has gained new insights into students, content, purposes, attitudes, strategies, her/his own strengths and weaknesses? What evidence is there of new insights into organizing and planning instruction and into its complex dynamic?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHART II
PROTOCOL FOR ASSESSING SYNTHESIS
AND LEVELS OF REFLECTIVITY
IN CASE REPORTS

A. Synthesis

1. In the descriptive sections of the Case Report are the various content factors presented in an integrated way? Is each factor summarized separately with no evidence of interpretation or linking with other factors?
2. Is the teacher's class described as a group with a distinct "personality"? Is there evidence that the teacher has discerned characteristics, idiosyncrasies, attitudes of and within the group? Is the description merely a listing, albeit in paragraph form, of demographic information, e.g. number of boys and girls, percentages in ability levels, numbers from various ethnic backgrounds, age range or age average, etc.?
3. Does the description of the school's goals, purposes, curricula, programs, faculty and resources communicate anything about the school as a dynamic organization? Is there any evidence in the narrative of interpretation of formal documents related to these dimensions of the school; any sense of what the teacher makes of these things in terms of her/his own work in the school?

B. Levels of Reflection

1. Does the teacher view her/himself as one who carries out instruction following a pre and externally set script, guide, format or cues? Are purposes, as given in curricular materials or guides, simply accepted and acted upon by the teacher?
2. Is the teacher's analysis purely technical, focusing, for example, on the extent to which strategies employed were used accurately according to an external standard of performance?
3. Does the teacher view her/his role as including setting purposes, determining strategies, selecting materials, using and evaluating learnings? Is there evidence that the teacher consciously considers the educational purposes of the lesson; does the analysis consider the value or worth of the lesson to either the students or more comprehensive content understanding?
4. Does the teacher consider the appropriateness of materials and strategies used, the pace of the lesson, etc. in analyzing the successfulness of instruction?
5. Is there evidence that the teacher recognizes the assumptions, philosophical or theoretical foundations underlying her/his practice?
7. Is there evidence in the analysis section of the case report that the teacher is critically relating school practices and expectations to broader social, economic and political purposes?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHART I
CLASSROOM CASE REPORT
DIRECTIONS

Section I. Describe the context or environment of your teaching situation. Develop a narrative wide-angle lense snapshot of your class, curriculum, school, school community. Include what you consider to be important or illuminating about the context of your teaching.

Section II. A. Describe a success that you have had this year in each of the following areas:

1. Instruction
2. Classroom management and discipline

B. Describe a less-than-success that you have had this year in the same two areas.

Section III. Reflect on and analyze the successes and less-than-successes which you described in Section II of this report. Explain the bases for your judgment. Then explore the dimensions of teaching and contextual factors which you think influenced these situations. Some that might be pertinent:

your intentions;

your rationale for selecting and using the approaches and strategies you used;

your own knowledge of the subject matter and pertinent pedagogy;

your attitude and the attitudes and interests of your students;

other areas or issues.

Explain what you have learned from these successes and less-than-successes that you think you can apply in other situations. What have you learned about yourself and about teaching from these successes and less-than-successes?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TITLE VII BILINGUAL TEACHER PROGRAM SURVEY

BECAUSE OF THE NEW TEACHR RETENTION PROGRAM I WAS ABLE TO:

- Reflect upon my lessons/class management
- Make it through my first year!! Decide that our model of bilingual education was not effective and that I prefer English only as an alternative.
- I was able to get specific answers to my questions as they applied to my classroom.
- Became aware of methodologies.
- Share with others common concerns
- Learn different strategies to teaching LEP children. Also learned how to deal with behavioral incidents.
- Receive support that was necessary my first year teaching.
- Have an opportunity to share practice lessons with peers.
- Use new teaching approaches and I was also able to meet other bilingual teachers.
- Discuss issues of bilingual education with other teachers from my district. Also I was able to network.
- Understand may strategies of teaching and learned things from peers and our leaders.
- Improve and refine teaching skills and strategies
- I was able to talk with other teachers and share some common experiences and problem solve difficulty.
- Consult with my fellow peers on classroom management skills.
- Develop lessons using lots of visuals for children.

WHAT WOULD YOU CHANGE OR RECOMMEND TO MAKE FUTURE NEW BILINGUAL TEACHER RETENTION PROGRAM MORE EFFECTIVE?

- A more structured program.
- More effective curriculum be provided to the classroom teacher to ease the burden of double preparation without double pay.
- Perhaps a few more guest speakers.

- More training through practice.
- The whole program is basically sharing very little methodology.
- More classroom visits.
- Use it as more of a resource for teachers to share ideas and make up material appropriate to grade level.
- More methodology training.
- Maybe hold the meetings in different teachers' classrooms - to receive some additional ideas.
- Class observation of peers classroom for individual help.
- To have the participants visit several bilingual classrooms and to spend one day in the classrooms and to spend one day in the classroom of the cluster leader.
- The program was set-up in a lecture style. It should change to require more participation while modeling effective teaching strategies.
- I would recommend to have visitations in bilingual classroom.
- Invite more specialized speakers to speak about current educational issues.
- I would like to have visited more bilingual classrooms.
- A classroom visit from cluster leaders, a classroom visit to cluster leader's classroom, and sit and plan a week's lesson plans to manage Spanish/English groups.

OTHER COMMENTS IN REWARD TO THE PROGRAM:

- The program was a good idea.
- Lack of preparation from cluster leaders.
- Bilingual Education is a joke. Instead, what students need is instruction in English Only with a Sheltered approach.
- Not enough support in the classroom--no teach aides.
- The instructor was excellent, motivational and inspiring.
- Great support from other.
- Provide more bilingual resources.
- Enhance program by having more precentors.
- Have more time to do "make it projects."

- I was able to acquire and implement new teaching strategies.
- Excellent group support.
- Learned new teaching strategies and will be using them in my classroom.
- Great program.
- Meeting with cluster leaders should be more brainstorming.
- San Diego City School's mentor workshop should be encouraged to attend.
- I would like to choose my own workshops to attend.

EVALUATION OF NEW BILINGUAL TEACHER PROGRAM

QUALITATIVE REPORT

WHAT DO YOU FEEL WERE SOME OF THE STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM?

- This entire program is an excellent idea - sure wish it was around my first year: The opportunity to share ideas and ask for help in "crisis" situations, I believe was great. Outside speakers/presentations seemed very helpful to the new teachers.
- New teachers need time to meet and "bond" with other new and experienced teachers. This program provided that Brechtel and Holy were outstanding guest speakers, as they demonstrated their techniques with students.
- Speakers on: Whole Language - Marsha & Linea, Spanish Literature - Schon. Make It Take It Workshop - would have liked to have more of these, being that we're new and "second language" teachers we could've have really grown and shared materials instead of each recreating materials!
- I enjoyed all of the "hands-on" workshops. I feel new teachers need materials, ideas, etc.! The most valuable speakers to me were the "Whole Language Approach." I learned so much. Next year please provide the teachers in your program with workshops such as these--not boring speakers!
- Make it, Take it Workshop very valuable and practical-direct application to classroom. Language experience and conference at Raddison were most valuable also. I appreciate the funds $100 for books, etc. Thanks!
- The guest speakers, Dr. Schon, Ida Malian and Richard Biffle in particular. They offered lots of information that was useful and could be implemented immediately in our classroom situations.
- Having some of these interesting and good presenters that really had good things, ideas, etc. for us to use or try in the classroom.
- When we had "hands on" presentations.
- When philosophy and making of units re combined in a workshop (Brecht, Halley).
- The presentations that I could go to school and experience with.
- The keynote speakers and getting practical ideas for use in classroom.
- Many of the problems I encountered during my first year were deal with.
- The discussions of relevant issues to the teachers and the presenters Linea and Marcia from Fountain Valley School District were excellent, Rich Biffle, too.

- Most of the presenters were very good. Would like to see more specific information on how or when to transition and and also more guidance as to how to write case studies. Program is excellent and should be continued.
- Some of the strengths were the presenters in the program and the opportunity to share experiences and frustrations.
- The chance to ask questions after being in a class. Speaking with many knowledgeable people on various topics. Time to compare notes with colleagues.
- Having such experts to listen to that probably I wouldn't have the opportunity to meet otherwise.
- New to working with other. We are all-together and in need of support and guidance.
- When the literature unit was introduce, how to implement it.
- Seminar presentations on "Whole Language."
- Literature presentations from Valley Center. Great Ideas received.
- The whole language inservice and the Hispanic Literature program.
- Meeting with peers and realizing I'm not the only one with problems.
- The presentation of Whole Language.
- Knowing that others are having as many problems as I am . Thinking up ways to solve problems, sharing ideas-and the $100 was great benefit!
- The speaker presentations; discussions on critical incidents. The flexibility of class attendance; the warmth and support one feels when attending this class not only from the cluster leaders but from the other teachers as well.
- I feel the most beneficial aspect of this program has been the time we've spent together and the bond we've built among the members from our own district. I also feel that we've benefitted from the connections with other districts. I think we've really learned from each other.
- Certain presenters were excellent - the opportunity to go to CABE and the Literature conference.
- The speakers Dr. Schon and Ida Malian. The Integrated Language were excellent and relative to my needs.
- The basic idea of a support system is valuable, and I enjoyed meeting people experiencing similar situations to mine. Classroom money was also very valuable.
- Being able to develop a network of teachers sharing the same experience.
- I feel that the Whole Language Workshop was extremely useful.

- The cluster leaders are excellent resource people. The whole language, cooperative learning seminars were helpful.
- I liked getting into groups and sharing grade level ideas.
- I feel that just talking with other first time teachers about my frustrations was such a relief. Knowing that I was not alone made a big difference to help me make it through the year. Much of the advice was very helpful.
- I really enjoyed being able to talk with my peers and leaders about my class to get ideas. I also was impressed with the whole language presentation.
- The experiences from each other during our discussions. Thank you so much!

That fellow teachers would help us solve problems we might be having in class.

- The open communication that led to great discussions about similar problems we could relate to.
- Peer and leader support!!
- The presentations, specifically the Whole Language Literature class.

WHAT DO YOU FEEL WERE WEAKNESSES IN THE PROGRAM?

- During some of the discussion groups, perhaps certain topics could have been assigned the previous week to be discused and items shared the following week. Or simply emphasize the idea of bringing something in to share with others. (Some people were good about sharing, but others never did)
- There seemed to be some confusion among teachers in my group as to the nature of assignments and or due dates - not always, just occasionally. Also, the half hour "sharing" might have been structural a bit more - perhaps one or two grade level teachers designated as "sharers" for the week, providing copies to all others in the group.
- Very unorganized and unfair!. Assigned papers were never clearly explained. For those of us who worked hard deserved full credit and for those who did not deserved just what they put into it! All of us attending Saturday put time into this course and should be paid $.
- The case studies!! The speakers such as Rich Biffel etc. who only talk are not needed (lectures) and theory! I feel that all teachers on or off track should be compensated equally.
- Too much lecture, theory
- Case studies caused stress and were burden for new teachers (Re-think assignment please)
- All participants should be paid equally for attendance. Traditional teachers exert equal effort to attend evening and weekend classes. Equal pay for equal work!

- More efficient notification of changes and cancellations of meeting.
- When receiving guidelines for our case studies they should be clear. These guidelines seemed to change at every class meeting. We were frustrated and disoriented. Deadlines seemed to change also. When a deadline is given it should not be changed!
- A lot of time was wasted! Some people not being on time and the presenters having to start late.
- Some very dry speakers. Some told things we knew - some spoke of irrelevant topics. Writing the case studies was a waste. A unit would be more relevant to our teaching needs and goals.
- It could have had more organization.
- Some presenters such as Nadine Bezuk. The lack of organization and classes starting consistently late.
- Dr. Bezuk--all she did was present catalogs--no methodologies on teaching math.
- The lack of organization and the lack of information as to how to do a case study. I feel that next time students (new teachers) should be taught how to do a case study in a step by step method. More information needs to be given as to how to prepare a case study and how it would be evaluated.
- It seemed a bit disorganized. Dates changed, not having a set meeting time, lack of clear instruction for case studies.
- I don't think the case studies were valuable and caused some stress. Perhaps something else could be substituted.
- Each district had some needs that were unique and needed to be addressed with resources from within that district. Some flexibility in scheduling inservices for those particular needs would be great
- The lack of information of presentations, dates and time.
- Most of the presenters were of little interest to me. Unorganized schedule (class time, place, deadlines, etc.). Not enough examples or details on what was expected from us.
- Case study. Some presenters were boring. Not enough information on expectations.
- The disorganization. Not having a set schedule. Also I feel that I was always on time, never missed a class but yet others abused the class needs for of a concern of who attended and who stayed for class.
- The presentation of Critical Thinking.
- At times I felt the discussions were too lengthy.
- There was not enough time to visit the classrooms you would like to visit.

- I would say the weakest component to this program has been the lack of organization - I feel that there were many a time that we did not know where we were to go or what we were to do! This program has been quite successful, but with little more effort being placed in organization I see it really improving.

- Lack of organization and professionalism classes did not begin on time. Dates were changed. Deadlines arbitrarily extended without notice. Many teachers felt very frustrated by these problems.

- Specific, dates, guidelines for papers were very unclear. Due dates should be clear. This cause lot of anxiety, since other case studies came in whenever they were received. This is not fair to the students who first worked hard to make the mentioned deadline.

- Much wasted time. Class was to begin at 4:30 p.m., but for those who arrived on time, they just sat around waiting for at least a half an hour, this is very frustrating.when you been rushing to try to arrive on time. It did not seem to be valued when people were on time, so most arrived later all the time.

- It is a pretty strong program.

- I felt one case study was enough. A different kind of assignment would be better.

- The time we spent in class on Wednesdays was sometimes wasted because we started late many times.

- I feel some of the presentations with speakers too much materials were being just consecrate on just one lesson for just one subject and gone from beginning to end.

- None, it was great!!

- The cluster groups were useful but I would have liked for our leader to have visited my class and received feedback on teaching method, classroom management, etc.

- Maybe, more $$$ to spend.

- Too much discussion in cluster groups. It seemed like the critical incidents are not too critical. I think I could have more useful information by having my leader visit my class and see how I handle things and then have her give me feedback for improvement. It is still hard to work 2 ELEP'S groups, 3 reading groups and computer rotations all day long.

WE WOULD APPRECIATE YOUR COMMENTS ON HOW TO IMPROVE THE PROGRAM FOR NEXT YEAR. NOW THAT YOU HAVE SURVIVED YOUR FIRST YEAR OF TEACHING, YOU MIGHT SPECIFICALLY NOTE PROBLEMS YOU HAVE ENCOUNTERED, FRUSTRATIONS, AREAS OF TRAINING WHERE YOU NEEDED TO KNOW MORE, AREA WHERE SUPPORT WOULD HAVE BEEN USEFUL, ETC.

- Perhaps some time could be spent going over "teacher responsibilities" in terms of the law (i.e., reporting suspected child abuse, parents who verbally threaten teachers, etc.)

- Please do not waste 1st & 2nd year teachers' "time." As a new teacher I needed prep time and make-it take-it workshops would have made this class worthwhile. Also speakers like Marsha, Linea and Schon provided excellent ideas for us! So stick with these two suggestions: speakers and make-it take-it!

- Cluster leaders are a big plus and I felt my cluster leader (Wendy) gave me the support I needed as a first year teacher!

- No lectures/theory. Lots of "hands-on" "make-it take-it" workshops

- Non-bilingual administrators (principals) need training - extensive about bilingual program needs. Districts need mentor teachers for new teachers. New teachers need list of materials, resources, etc. available to them.

- More organizations, specific guidelines.

- Have a more organized session.

- Guidance with case reports.

- I think we could have had more discussions on critical incidents where we can ask and share our concerns and received answers from good experienced teachers.

- Rather than case studies I would have benefited more from development of units and lessons to implement in my classroom - specific ideas in the areas of language arts, science, social studies and math. Frustrations and "I did not know" areas were: IEPS, Integrated Curriculum--hard to do, and Centers organization.

- Topics to cover: Transitioning (steps). Oral language development by same people who were presenters this year at Valley Center. Increase pay for cluster leaders. Continue to reward participants with stipend. Teacher/principal relations. More observations of bilingual teachers.

- Lack of information and guidance at may district as to procedures, expectations etc. More training on special procedures, SST's etc.

- We need to have guidance in ways to initiate change without causing discussion in the class, school or district. We also need reassurance that since bilingual education is changing it's expected that it's not going to be perfect program and that's O.K.

- It would have been nice if Chula Vista could have been to the fall classes. I don't know what area the fall presenters covered.

- Classroom management was a topic brought up constantly in cluster groups. Acting out behaviors was a very important issue and we need more alternatives and strategies to use in this area. Time for classroom observation to observe other schools. More clarity of papers due. i.e., length, content, and date due. Beginning and ending times firm, structured dates and speakers set in September if possible.

- How to seek material and information in Spanish to use in the classroom. Classroom visitations to help guide the teacher in better management of her classroom, school planning and time management.

- * Punctuality, Organization, concentrating on specific areas at a time, more input from us (sharing personal ideas, curriculum, etc.), more on literature, hands on materials-making units, student books, more equality on pay (year round vs. traditional), consistency on where and when we're going to meet for class (scheduling).

- More detail explanation on what is expected from us on papers. Star on time-class, sharing with peers, literature & reading ideas, how to have time to plan lessons, consistency on meeting place, due dates for papers.

- The speakers need to have more answers on classroom problems. Maybe need to get regular classroom teachers to speak. I feel I got more out of talking with my cluster leaders and fellow teachers than from the speakers.

- I had frustrations when I had to correct so many papers, and then record all that information. I had problems with my discipline and keeping-up with paper work. I received so many papers of students entering, of students leaving, of the district.....I wish I knew a system that would help me keep-up.

- I would have liked to attend more workscope in different curriculum areas, such as: science, social science, music, etc. Also trying to get a hold of material in Spanish is quite difficult & very frustrating--maybe a field trip to a book store in Tijuana would help!

- Support would have been useful in dealing with the emotional problems that children bring with them to school.

- I would recommend including more make it/take it workshops-- it seems that new teachers often are lacking the time to create new materials for their classrooms. I would also recommend treating this course as a true "graduate level course" and not something we'd be paid to participate in. No graduate courses pay you to attend! It is our choice to take the course & thus we should be expected to attend & complete all necessary requirements. In addition to the above 2 mentioned items I would recommend passing out a course syllabus.

- The things that were more classroom oriented, hands-on are the things that you retain the longest. A first year teacher doesn't have a lot of material to draw from and things like the whole language materials are invaluable.

- I realize this is a pilot program, however, there needed to be more clear directions as to what was expected as far as case studies. Some organization and understanding between all cluster leaders was lacking. Between both class leaders Dr. Pacheco and Dr. Omark there also was needed for more direct communication, in order to convey the same ideas and directions.

- One of the biggest problems with first year teachers is not enough time to develop materials. Often when there is time, the resources are not there. I would enjoy some make-it take-it kind of days where the resources are there and I could actually come away with something I could implement in my classroom. Most of us are already bombarded with meetings and inservices, but these are difficult to put into practice without the materials or the time to make them. Also, although I was given 5 days release time to see other teachers, I did not feel any guidance on this, so they were not used I did not know who to observe. If class is to begin at 4:30, begin it at that time. Possibly a later time is needed to accommodate those living further away.

- My language arts I feel are still weak. I'm probably doing a fair job, but I would love maybe the cluster leader to visit my classroom and offer advice.

- I would suggest not using every Wednesday class meeting as a complaint/problem solving session. A critical incident log can be useful but class sessions could have been used more effectively for planning or something else.

- It would have been nice if the class started earlier so that we could get ideas on how to set up our classrooms, discipline program, classroom arrangement, etc. It would be good to see how everybody progressed throughout the whole year.

- With me, knowing how to just keep up w/AGP was a struggle, but I guess since that will be gone next year, we won't have to worry about it anymore. I think it would really help to have an expert teacher for each grade level to discuss some of the "surprises" you find when going through the curriculum for the first time.

- I think organizational skills are very important, I've gone to workshops where teachers show how they keep their math, language, arts...papers, using different files, boxes, etc. These ideas came in handy and would have been nice at the beginning of the year.

- More classroom visitations, visit each other's classrooms to get different ideas from each other. They could also meet in each others' classrooms, every week in a different school.

- More on classroom management, especially when there's no aide and you have a multitude of groups. Information on testing (CTBS) and what resources there are (scoring high etc.) that we might use.

- Emphasize on finding a buddy system with another student teacher & keep in touch with each other. It helps out very much. More training in student special needs, & how to deal with parents.

- I still need help in meeting the length of instruction time the state requires for each subject. It seems that even if I have a time schedule, there is always something I leave out. I need more ideas on writing topics, and more ideas on making better evaluations on children's improvements.

AGAIN, BASED UPON YOUR FIRST YEAR'S EXPERIENCE, WHAT DO YOU FEEL SHOULD HAVE OBVIOUSLY BEEN TAUGHT IN YOUR PRESERVICE AND STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS?

- Teaching/learning is definitely a process, so becoming a teacher (an outstanding one) is most certainly a process as well. I applaud this program for its sensitivity to the needs of new teachers & hope it continues for coming years.

- I cannot rate SDSU's teaching program--I hope it's not as unorganized & unfair as this course was. However, including suggestions from above question would definitely benefit wanna-be teachers (i.e. speakers & make-it, take its).

- Whole language approach. Spanish literature units (Oceanside Unified School District, Sherry Freeman has an excellent presentation, Sherry Freeman de Leyva, Coordinator.
- How to set up discipline programs (hands on). How to create and manage learning centers. Specific ways to get migrant parents educated about school and involved. How to meet individual needs with 32 students at so many different levels of ability
- Whole language, teaching literature vs. reading basal and just having a list of resources for materials books, etc.
- A thorough, more complete session on Whole Language Approach (the way it was presented this time). More on Spanish Literature
- The realities of teaching are very different from the expectations. A class that better prepares for the entry shock.
- More classroom management
- First of all I think discipline (behavior) , classroom management is what shocked me the most when I started. I was not prepared to deal with it, I had not expected to encounter this so soon. We did have a class where this was mentioned in the credential program, but it was not emphasized as it should have been. I think it would have helped if some new teachers (1st year) had come and shared how hard it was, that way we could have experienced it closer.
- -Where to begin- What things you need to do the 1st week of school to prepare for the children and to survive the 1st few weeks. Whole Language , Assertive Discipline.
- Stress management techniques
- How to be creative when materials are not available for use. How to make meaningless objects for something useful.
- Children's literature (making up unit) and more hands on.
- Literature (making units), more hands on and schedules were not kept to date.
- How to handle an English/Spanish program at the same time. Where to get Spanish material
- Whole Language, Sheltered English, assessment (how to write test), math theory way, how to keep records not spending too much time on them.
- How to detect learning disabilities, how to help, etc.
- What to look for in evaluating wether or not a child has emotional problems or other kinds of problems.
- I wish I had had more on children's literature in both Spanish and English. I personally feel that a course on Educationally Law should be part of every teachers' preparation-legal responsibilities, liabilities, etc.

- Actual classroom observations in a bilingual setting. Demonstrations of Whole Language (Integrations). Possibly a teacher to discuss in detail what, how you set up your classroom. Advice on ideas for learning centers. Finally, science and math could be subject to get specialist in to give ideas.

- Better organization systems.

- More of the details in management and everyday problems. For example, now that its the end of the year, how do you close out class?

- Student teachers should be carefully placed based on personality and educational philosophy. Student teachers should be given responsibilities for all of the administrative duties. They should participate in parent conferences and parent contacts.

- I think that what we learned during the credential program was sufficient enough. I feel like we were very prepared for our first year of teaching.

- I think planning for a week and setting up a folder for a non-Spanish speaking sub would be a good thing to go over.

- I would like to mare more classroom visits to actually see Whole Language, Cooperative Learning, etc, being used. I think the demo we had for Whole Language was great because there was "real" children.

- More practice on discipline problems and how to know the child who needs help or have a learning disability problem.

- Maybe touch upon the politics involved with regards to Bilingual Education and what sources that are available for us. I am discovering a lot of materials that I din not know existed, it would have been nice to know what is out there. Even though computer technology is part of the curriculum for clear credential, I believe that we should take it within the one year program, it would have helped me a lot this year.

- special inservice on little end of the year and and beginning of year must do's, cum files, student cards, etc.. Emphasize on Merci Ramirez's presentation, a definite must, organization.

- The reality about getting materials and the very little paid prep time.